



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,660	09/30/2003	Timothy M. Simon	CHOND.65023	5821
27629	7590	03/22/2006	EXAMINER	
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP			WILLSE, DAVID H	
200 OCEANGATE, SUITE 1550			ART UNIT	
LONG BEACH, CA 90802			PAPER NUMBER	

3738

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

88

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/675,660	Applicant(s) SIMON ET AL.	
	Examiner Dave Willse	Art Unit 3738	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3738

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 21-23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Jansson et al., WO 98/52498 A1. Spaced rodlets 1 on the outer periphery define a plurality of ridges (Figure 1), and a lubricious surface is formed at both ends in embodiments comprising agar or gelatine, for example (Derwent abstract, line 7). Regarding claim 13, the ridge planes are substantially perpendicular to a central axis along a transverse cross-section bisecting the cylindrical surface of the pre-formed mass. Regarding claim 15, the ridges are discontinuous in that they each comprise rodlets which “are preferably of spherical or cylindrical

Art Unit: 3738

sub-units” (Derwent abstract, lines 4-5). Regarding claims 22 and 23, the “approximately identical spaced (3) units” (Derwent abstract, line 3; Figure 1) define bores.

Claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Oka et al., JP 6-339490 A. Figure 4 illustrates a plurality of ridges formed about a lower or distal portion of the outermost periphery. Since the articular bearing surface 7 is of a polyvinyl alcohol water-bearing gel 6 (JPO English abstract, lines 11-13), there are lubricious surfaces at both ends of the artificial articular cartilage 1. Regarding claim 15, the ridges are discontinuous because they are of fiber meshes (Figure 4; JPO English abstract).

Claims 14, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oka et al., JP 6-339490 A. Regarding claim 14, an artificial articular cartilage with a threaded (ridged) surface was well known in the art at the time of the present invention and would have been obvious in order to improve the anchorage into bone, particularly prior to osseointegration, with further motivation have been provided by the last sentence of the JPO English abstract. Regarding claim 17, polyhedral shapes were likewise common in the art and would have been obvious in order to better resist torsional forces. Regarding claim 19, tapered threaded and/or root surfaces would have been an obvious modification in order to enhance self-tapping and/or frictional engagement into the bone, as known to the ordinary practitioner. Regarding claim 20, barb-shaped threads would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in order to impart a locking function to the implant.

Claims 12-14, 16, 18, 21, 22, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Stone et al., US 5,306,311, which discloses a lubricious surface (column 7,

Art Unit: 3738

lines 49-53) and a plurality of ridges (e.g., column 6, lines 3-16). Regarding claim 25: column 3, lines 15-17.

Claims 15, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone et al., US 5,306,311. Regarding claims 15 and 20, discontinuous ridges with a barb shaped cross-section would have been an obvious modification to the ordinary practitioner in order to facilitate self-tapping and locking into the bone, with further motivation having been provided by the previously cited passage at column 6, lines 3-16. Regarding claim 17, a polyhedral shape would have been obvious in order to better resist torsion.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US 5,015,247:

column 8, lines 48-51.

The Applicant's remarks have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection, which were necessitated by the added language pertaining to the lubricious surface. Therefore:

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3738

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Willse whose telephone number is 571-272-4762. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Dave Willse
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3738